THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS'

MILLENNIAL STAR.

[ESTABLISHED 1840].

"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel; for he hath visited and redeemed his people" (LUKE 1: 68).

No. 7, Vol. LXXVII. Thursday, February 18, 1915. Price One Penny.

BAPTISM.

I. DIFFERENT OPINIONS.

THE view of the Roman Catholic church on baptism may be gathered from the canons of the Council of Trent. In these the following doctrines are condemned as heresies: That Christian baptism is not superior to the baptism of John; that the language of our Lord in John 3: 5 is to be understood metaphorically; that heretical baptism is invalid; that baptism is not necessary to salvation, and that infant sprinkling is not Christian baptism. All who hold these views are anathematized. The opposite of each of these propositions must, then, be regarded as the orthodox doctrine of Rome.

That church defines baptism as the sacrament of regeneration by water in the Word, and states that, as it is an ablution, immersion, affusion and sprinkling are equally valid. There must, however, be sponsors who are willing to assume the responsibility for the proper instruction of the baptized. Rome teaches, further, that baptism is to be administered only to those who are willing to receive it, wherefore the insane and the unconscious are not proper subjects; but infants can be baptized, though they have no will of their own in the matter, at the request and on the faith of parents, or guardians, if these are believers; and, if they are unbelievers, then on the faith of the church.

The effect of baptism, Rome teaches, is the remission of sin—not only pardon, but its actual removal. By baptism the soul is cleansed and made pure, just as the body is freed from filth by washing in water. The original sin is washed away. And not only that, but the soul is sanctified by it. All the benefits of redemption are conveyed to man through baptism.

The chief difference between the Roman and Greek churches on this ordinance is, that the Greeks administer baptism by immersion three times, and that confirmation follows immediately upon baptism, even in the case of infants, while the Church of Rome administers baptism by affusion, and postpones confirmation until later years.

The Lutheran church also teaches that baptism is necessary to salvation and that infants are proper subjects. Generally, however, Lutheran theologians explain that though baptism is necessary, God can save the children of men without it, when baptism cannot be had, even as He can sustain human life without food if He sees fit to do so. Through baptism, they hold, all that is necessary to salvation is communicated to man. By baptism man receives remission of sins; the gift of faith; reception into the covenant of grace; adoption among the children of God; deliverance from the power of Satan; and, finally, life eternal.

This is effected, they say, not by the water, but by the power of the Holy Spirit inherent in the Word by which the baptismal water is consecrated. It is the "word of God which is in, with, and under the water," and faith in that word, especially the promise, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," which produce the effects in baptism.

The Lutherans freely admit that faith is a necessary condition of baptism, but they baptize infants on the peculiar ground that these are capable of having a true and living faith. The Word, they say, produces faith in all who hear it, provided they do not resist its influence; and as infants have no power of resistance, the Word accompanying the application of the baptismal water produces faith in them. Dr. Krauth says on this subject: "This grace is offered whenever baptism is administered, and is actually conferred by the Holy Spirit, whenever the individual receiving it does not present in himself a conscious voluntary barrier to its efficacy. This barrier, in the case of an individual personally responsible, is unbelief. In the case of an infant, there is no conscious voluntary barrier, and there is a divinely wrought receptivity of grace."

The doctrine of the Reformed churches is stated thus by Dr. Charles Hodge, a Princeton professor, in his *Systematic Theology*:

"The sacraments (1) are ordinances of divine appointment. (2) They are means of grace, and therefore not to be undervalued or neglected. (3) Their efficacy does not depend upon any virtue in them or in him by whom they are administered, but upon the attending influence of the Holy Spirit. (4) Their efficacy is not tied to the time of their administration; and they are not the exclusive channels of the spiritual benefits which they signify, so that such benefits can be received only through and in the use of the sacrament. We have by faith alone, and by the free gift of God, all that the sacraments are made the means of communicating. * * * The sacraments are not to be neglected or under-

valued, because men can be saved without them. (5) So far as adults are concerned, true, living faith in those who receive the sacraments is the indispensable condition of their saving and sanctifying influence."

The *Heidelberg Catechismus* asks: "Is, then, the external baptism of water, the washing away of sins?" It answers: "It is not: For the blood of Jesus Christ alone cleanses us from all sin."

The Westminster Confession: "Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized, are undoubtedly regenerated. The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding, by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in His appointed time."

Most of the churches believe in infant baptism, and, except the Greek church, administer the ordinance by pouring a little water on the head. There are, however, large bodies of Christians, which, like the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, practice immersion and admit only believers. Chief among these are the Baptists.

They teach that only those who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ are to be baptized, since the Lord in His commission to the Twelve clearly directed them to baptize only those who have been made disciples. Baptism, they say, is meaningless, unless it is the outward sign of an inward, moral change. They maintain that immersion is the only valid mode of baptism. But they also hold that forgiveness of sins must be obtained by faith previous to baptism.

It appears from this that there is a great deal of confusion in the world regarding this ordinance. In all the creeds truth and error are blended so thoroughly as to make the mixture useless. We can only set it aside and turn to the Word of God, as given through ancient and modern revelations, for unpolluted truth and enlightenment.

Orson Pratt defines baptism as "an ordinance whereby a believing, penitent sinner obtains a forgiveness of all past sins." He adds: "By being buried in the watery grave, the old man, as Paul says, is put off with all of his deeds; by rising from the liquid element, we put on the new man, become new creatures, and should henceforth walk in newness of life" (*The Kingdom of God*, page 5). That is baptism. It is a divinely instituted ordinance in which man is "born again"—whereby he enters the kingdom of heaven, just as by his natural birth he entered the physical world.

In considering the doctrine of baptism, these questions should be answered in the light of revelation: (1) What is the mode of baptism? (2) Who are the subjects of baptism? (3) Who has authority to administer it? (4) What is the proper formula? (5) What are the effects? (6) Is baptism necessary? (7) Can baptism be performed vicariously by the living for the dead?

1. What is the proper mode of baptism?

It is customary to speak of immersion, sprinkling, and affusion as so many different modes of baptism, but, as a matter of fact, there is only one mode of that ordinance, and there can be no more. Sprinkling is sprinkling and affusion is affusion, but neither is baptism, for baptism is a complete burial, or submersion, in water, such as is most easily and naturally accomplished by immersion. No application of water which fails to entirely surround, or cover, the person who is being baptized, is baptism.

In revelations contained in the Doctrine and Covenants this is plainly taught. He who baptizes is there instructed to "immerse him or her in the water, and come forth again out of the water" (Sec. 20: 74). Baptism is a "burial": "They are they who received the testimony of Jesus, and believed on his name and were baptized after the manner of his burial, being buried in the water in his name, and this according to the commandment which he has given" (Doc. and Cov. 76: 51). Further: "The baptismal font was instituted as a simile of the grave, and was commanded to be in a place underneath where the living are wont to assemble, to show forth the living and the dead" (Doc. and Cov. 128: 13). In the Book of Mormon we are shown how baptism was performed by Alma: "After Alma had said these words, both Alma and Helam were buried in the water; and they arose and came forth out of the water rejoicing" (Mosiah 18: 14). In III. Nephi 11: 26 we read: "And then shall ye immerse them in the water, and come forth again out of the water." This is the instruction of our Lord to the Nephites, and He also declares: "And according as I have commanded you thus shall ye baptize. And there shall be no disputations among you" (III. Nephi 11: 28).

The Prophet Joseph Smith: "The gospel requires baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, which is the meaning of the word in the original language; namely, to bury, or immerse" (*History of the Church*, Vol. 5, page 499).

Heber C. Kimball: "If you have a little water sprinkled in your face, poured upon your head, or you kneel in the water, is that baptism? No! you must go and be buried with Christ—be immersed—overwhelmed in the water. This requirement is binding upon all, both high and low * * * And I will say to you, gentlemen and ladies, who have not complied with this, you will have to do so in a day to come, before you can receive an exaltation in the kingdom of God" (*Journal of Discourses*, Vol. 8, page 210).

B. H. Roberts: "The terms 'buried' and 'planted' are in plain

allusion to the manner in which the saints had received the ordinance of baptism, which could not have been by sprinkling or pouring, as there is no burial, or planting, in the likeness of Christ's death, or being raised in the likeness of his resurrection, in that; but in immersion there is" (*The Gospel*, page 185).

Dr. James E. Talmage: "Scriptural authority warrants none other form than immersion" (*Articles of Faith*, page 141).

This is the doctrine of the Church.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

GOSPEL POWER.

"THE power of God"—so is the gospel termed by Paul. The gospel is the means unto salvation—the end. It is a moving force. The gospel, when accepted, is fuel that feeds the furnace of intelligence, which, when properly fed, will move the soul on toward "salvation." It "is the power of God unto salvation," and it is the only vital force existing in the world to-day that can thoroughly revolutionize our sinful world. Many laws and theories are extant; yet not one of these can influence the individual for salvation as can the requirements of God, when obeyed. And this, because of the virtue of the laws themselves.

"Thou shalt not steal," says the law of the land. "Thou shalt not steal," reads the law of God. Which of these laws has the greater influence over the sons of men? Which law carries with it the greater power for good? I venture the opinion, and I think it will stand without contradiction, that if this law were lived by everyone as a law of God, and not as a law of the land—or of men—it would be broken only once where now it is broken hundreds of times. The reason is obvious. Who is the world serving, God or Mammon? What will prevent the man who fears not God from stealing, if he so desires, if he think he will be able to escape the punishment of civil laws? What power will the law of the land have with him? He will break such laws with impunity, if his desires run in that direction. If he is not to suffer from his sin, he feels free, in a sense, to commit sin, but when he understands that he is the one to suffer in full payment of his unrighteousness, he is more or less bound to refrain from it. If he understands that the Lord has said, "Thou shalt not steal," his careless indifference towards it becomes a firm determination to live it—a result of the power of God—the gospel.

It is life eternal to know God and His Son, Jesus Christ; likewise it is salvation to know and live the gospel of Christ. Counterfeit and man-made schemes will lack the power and influence for good that is contained in the Truth. If one breaks a law of the land he is duly punished—provided he is "caught." Hence we read: "Thou shalt not be found out." Too many people sin, thinking that they

will not be found out. If a man disregards a law of God he will be punished, because there is no hiding sin from Him. Therein lies the virtue of God's laws—the gospel.

"The power of God unto salvation" exists in the world to-day, though so very few understand it. As coal in the mine is dead and inactive, but becomes a mighty power for good when it is placed in the furnace, so do the revelations of God become the "power of God unto salvation" when rightly understood in the minds of men. The Bible contains, within its covers, the gospel which, according to Paul, is a mighty influence for good; a glance around us to-day will soon convince us that either the Bible is misunderstood or misapplied, or both. Christianity has lost its influence for good, and the way unto salvation is not to be found in and of the contending creeds of so-called Christendom to-day. "If the salt hath lost his savor, wherewith shall it [the earth] be salted?"

There are vital laws that no government on earth tries to enforce. The Church of Christ proclaims them, and enjoins its members to keep them. All, save the gospel, then, is more or less powerless in influencing the individual in these respects. The laws of nature, the laws of health, the laws of love, of kindness, of happiness are found in their fulness in the gospel of Christ. Hence it is the only real power for good in these directions. Laws concerning the welfare of the human body are not found save in the gospel. What power is to guide us rightly in the care of our bodies? Do temperance laws teach men to refrain from drinking liquor? Never. Were the gospel thoroughly understood there would be no need of such laws. Again, the gospel is the only thing which endeavors to direct the thoughts of man. It even gives us laws concerning what and how we shall think. It is the one great power for good in this direction. And not only does it govern the thoughts of man, but also his words and actions.

It is a common understanding among men that "he who is well educated is well off," and men instinctively crave for knowledge; yet there is nothing which so much inspires the individual to gain intelligence as the gospel. "No man can be saved in ignorance," or, may I say, man is as saved as he is intelligent? Where is there a greater truth?

Governments require obedience. The gospel teaches obedience. Civil laws say those who are not kind, honest, gentle, good, will be punished. The gospel, first of all, teaches kindness, honesty, and all other virtues, and leaves no room for those who are not honest, etc. A man may not be caught and punished as a thief; yet he may be a thief. One may not be held up as a liar, yet he may have lied. All who kill, who bear false witness, who lie, who commit adultery, and who sin in various ways are not, perhaps, brought to the bar of justice on this earth, and I think the very likelihood of their escaping justice was one of the things which prompted them

to sin. Oh, how much evil would be prevented if men would only believe and live the gospel!

The world is blindly staggering into a hell-pit dug for it by the false doctrines of men. Misery, crime and disease are rampant because of man's failure to cope with evil. Traditions and hopes that have been held up so long by blind superstition are now tottering because they are things of men and not of God. Satan seems to be successfully establishing the "kingdom of the devil" upon the earth which was created for the meek children of God. And these conditions will remain as they are until the gospel is brought in to "cleanse the earth from sin." The pity of it is that men are, as of old, rejecting the truth, vilifying the servants of God, and persecuting men for righteousness' sake—even as did the wicked in the days of Noah. Not until men repent of evil and turn to righteousness will conditions be reversed. And not until all men are willing and able to live the gospel will they know the magnificence of gospel power.

Birmingham. FERRY J. FAUX.

CONFERENCE APPOINTMENTS.

London	Sunday, March	7th,	1915.
Bristol	,, ,,	14	,,
Newcastle	,, ,,	21	,,
Irish	,, ,,	28	,,
Nottingham	,, April	4	,,
Hull...	,, ,,	11	,,
Leeds	,, ,,	18	,,
Norwich	,, ,,	25	,,
Liverpool	,, May	2	,,
Birmingham	,, ,,	9	,,
Sheffield	,, ,,	16	,,
Manchester	,, ,,	23	,,
Scottish	,, ,,	30	,,

HYRUM M. SMITH.

MARRIAGE by proxy is being contemplated in France. A bill has been introduced in the Chamber of Deputies, which will enable soldiers in active service to be married without being personally present during the ceremony. The marriage will take place with the ordinary forms and with the usual publicity, but with this difference, that the bridegroom will be represented by a person appointed by him to take his place, and an authorisation for the marriage will have to be given by the Minister of War and the Minister of Justice.

THE LATTER-DAY SAINTS' MILLENNIAL STAR.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1915.

EDITORIAL.

STUDY THE SCRIPTURES.

Latter-day Saints have been taught to pray, to praise God in song, to meet in worshiping assemblies on the Sabbath and at other times, and many other duties have been enjoined upon them for their temporal, as well as spiritual, welfare. If they are good, faithful Latter-day Saints, they attend to their prayers, because they know by experience that God hears and answers them; they are fond of song, realizing that "the song of the righteous is a prayer" (Doc. and Cov. 25: 12) acceptable to God; and they go to their meetings as willingly and eagerly as the people of the world hasten to amusement halls and social functions. But do they also read and study the Scriptures? Is it not to be feared that this duty is very much neglected even among the Latter-day Saints?

Our Lord told the Jews that the Scriptures testify of Him (John 5: 39), and the people of Berea are commended (Acts 17: 11) as being more noble than those of Thessalonica, because they "searched the scriptures daily," to find out whether Paul and Silas were preaching the truth. The Lord also commanded His servants, Joseph Smith and Oliver Cowdery, to devote their time to the studying of the Scriptures (Doc. and Cov. 24: 5; 25: 7; 26: 1), as well as preaching and expounding the Word of God, and this is certainly the duty of all Latter-day Saints, and especially those who bear the Priesthood.

The Scriptures testify of the Redeemer and the plan of salvation. They tell of the advent of the Son of God in the flesh; of His work and ministry; His sufferings and death; His resurrection and glorification. They tell also of the falling away from the Church, and the calamities that were to come over the earth on that account; they tell of the re-establishment of the Church through a "mighty angel," with a "little book" open in his hand; they tell us of the testimony of pestilence, famine, wars, and convulsions in nature, subsequent to the testimony of God's witnesses in the last days, if these are rejected; and they tell us about the coming of the Son of Man in glory, to establish His kingdom on earth. Those who neglect to study the Scriptures are more or less ignorant of these things. They are not aware that they are living in the midst of most important events.

Many think that the Scriptures are almost impossible to understand. And there is some truth in that objection. This applies

especially to the Old Testament, and, though in a smaller degree, to the New. The Book of Mormon and the Pearl of Great Price are generally more easy to understand, and the Doctrine and Covenants are quite plain if studied in connection with the history of the Church. But although the student of the Scriptures meets difficulties, some of which may be insurmountable, the greater portion of the Word of God is so clear that no one need to err in reading it. It all depends on the spirit in which it is read.

The Scriptures should be read in the spirit of humility and a desire to learn. Misunderstanding often comes from the fact that people open the sacred pages and read them with their minds full of prejudices and ideas made up beforehand. They read, not to learn, but to find proofs of their own views. They come, not as pupils, but as masters. And so it happens that truths most clearly revealed are most generally misunderstood, such, for instance, as these, that God is our Father, and that we are made in His image; or, that the light of revelation is needed now as much as ever.

When Christ came the Light shone in the darkness, but men comprehended it not, because their eyes were darkened by man-made doctrines and superstitious practices. A child-like docility, an obedient heart, and a prayerful disposition are essential to a correct understanding of the Scriptures, and before these all difficulties disappear.

Many rules have been framed for a correct interpretation. We may refer to one which is most practical: Read the Scriptures often and pray for wisdom. Read a whole book through, whenever possible, so as to get a general view of the plan and contents. Read it again and again. He who shall do this will gradually obtain the sense in which the particular author uses the words and phrases that he employs, and this is, after all, the true meaning. By frequent reading, familiarity with sacred history and portions of the history of many nations is acquired, and this is an invaluable aid. Then, whoever has access to the helps offered by reliable commentators should avail himself of them. And thus to a prayerful heart the Scriptures will be opened up, and furnish a safe guide to all truth.

The prophetic word is of special importance in our day and age, when God has stretched forth His mighty arm to prepare the way for the reign of His Son. Our Lord, when predicting the fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Temple, and the end of the old era, warned His disciples to flee, whenever they should see "the abomination of desolation"—the Roman standard—planted "in the holy place," lest they, too, should fall by the sword, or be sold into captivity. And it is said that they heeded the warning and were saved. The prophets have spoken no less clearly about the time in which we live, and the calamities of this age. They have warned this generation to escape to safety, by embracing the gospel and carrying out its precepts.

Let us study the Scriptures. Most of us could read a portion every day. On Sundays we could devote some time to reading and contemplating the Word of God in our homes. We would be all the better prepared for the public meetings, and all the more certain of being instructed and edified by the addresses we may listen to. For, it is a true saying that to him who has, shall be given. He who is full of the Word of God receives more benefit from prayer, from song, and from public meetings, than he whose heart is empty, or full only of worldly thoughts and interests.

HYRUM M. SMITH.

MILITARISM GLORIFIED.

ACCORDING to the doctrine of a prominent writer on historical subjects, the state is the highest human organization, the ultimate end and final standard. To quote: "The State is the highest thing in the external society of man: above it there is nothing at all in the history of the world." The state, then, according to this view, is superior to the church. This, of course, Catholics deny, and it is a question whether even Protestants can subscribe to it.

But the peculiar feature about the doctrine referred to is this, that it glorifies war as the very purpose for which a state exists. The state, it sets forth, has two functions to discharge; and these are, to administer law and to make war. Of the two, war, according to this view, would appear to be the greater. War, we are told, cannot be thought or wished out of the world: it is the only medicine for a sick nation. When we are sunk in the selfish individualism of peace, war comes to make us realize that we are members one of another. "The living God," the author quoted says, "will see to it that war shall always recur as a terrible medicine for humanity."

The author is, we understand, a Protestant, but in regard to this subject we do not hesitate to say that he is an infidel, denying the plain teachings of the Word of God.

The Hebrews were, we may say, a war-cradled nation, but their wars, except that for the possession of Canaan, their own country, were not wars of conquest. They were struggles for liberty, or for the vindication of divine justice against nations which had degraded themselves by blasphemous worship and unnatural sins. Their leaders and generals were men like Joshua, Gideon, Caleb, David, and, in later times, Mattathias and his son, Judas Maccabeus. They were men raised up to fight the battles for freedom and truth, when there was no other means of safe-guarding those cornerstones of human society.

How the Lord regards war is made very plain in the Scriptures.

1. In the Hebrew state all able-bodied men, twenty years old and upward, were liable to military service (Numbers 1: 3), but—and this is to be noted—the following were exempt: Priests and Levites;

a man having built a house and not yet having dedicated it, or planted a vineyard and not having eaten of its fruit; a man having newly married, and, finally, and most remarkable of all, a man "fearful and fainthearted." (Dent. 20: 5-8). All of which proves that in the Mosaic law divine service, domestic life, and agriculture were given a place of greater importance than war-making.

2. That the Lord does not look with favor upon His children making war on each other is, further, clear from the fact that He did not permit David to build a Temple because of his sanguinary record. "God said unto me, Thou shalt not build a house for my name, because thou hast been a man of war, and hast shed blood" (I. Chron. 28: 3). This alone settles for ever the question of God's views on war.

3. The prophetic word in all ages points to a time when the art of making war shall no longer be taught. It shall be obsolete. The next and highest stage in civilization will be one in which all international differences must be settled in the courts of nations, and not on battlefields. Peace shall then prevail, and truth shall be as abundant as error is now, for the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth "as the waters cover the sea" (Isaiah 11: 9).

4. In the New Testament wars are ascribed to the powers of evil. For so we read in the Revelation (16: 13, 14): "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." We read also that Satan will be bound preliminary to the ushering in of the Millennium, and that when, after that dispensation, he again is freed for a little time, wars will rage as before (Rev. 20: 7-10). This shows who is the real instigator of wars.

These facts the author referred to evidently ignores, or denies. His doctrine is diametrically opposed to the Christian doctrine, which teaches us that all dominion and power and glory will finally be surrendered to Him who is the Prince of Peace.

The war doctrine is not even rooted in the highest non-Christian civilization. The ancient Greek states tried to obviate war by the formation of amphictyonies, or federations of states, which were established for common worship and the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. And even the ancient Scandinavians, who delighted in war and conquest, looked forward to a time when a new order should be established in the world in which the dominant note would be peace, founded on justice.

Wars are inimical to the best interests of society. They are demoralizing, because when wars rage the laws of God and man are set aside and the brute is enthroned in the place of reason. That leaves its marks upon nations for years. They are enervating and weakening. Nations by too much blood-letting become

so feeble that they fall an easy prey to stronger invaders. In the wars the robust and healthy are killed off, and those not fit for hardships are left to propagate the race. This is unnatural. Wars are a hindrance to civilization. In battles many a genius is lost; many a Shakespeare, many an Edison, many a Mozart, many a Gladstone, many a Demosthenes is lost to the human family, and its progress is thereby retarded. Crimes flourish in war-infested zones, and generally continue to flourish for many years after the actual hostilities have ceased. For all these reasons war must be regarded as a calamity. There have been righteous wars, in defense of home and liberty against despotism and vandalism; but war itself is, nevertheless, a calamity. And the people of God cannot but pray fervently for the coming of the day of the Lord and His kingdom.

The state is a divine institution. That is not disputed. Governments are instituted by God; but not for the purpose of making war, but to make good laws and to protect all good citizens in their rights and prerogatives, by restraining and punishing those who break the law. They exist for the purpose of fostering and protecting education, industries, commerce, sciences, arts, inventions and everything that helps to advance the children of men. Such are the functions of the state.

Wars belong to the past, like cannibalism and slavery, and they will surely cease when the Sun of Righteousness rises in its glory.

J. M. S.

WHAT WAR MEANS TO WOMEN.

In the *Woman's Home Companion* for October, 1914, a contributor, Mrs. Aimee Georges, tells a graphic story about the siege of Paris in 1871. It is interesting reading at this time. The following are extracts from the article:

I remember when the Prussians entered Paris at the close of the awful siege. They had claimed the right to march inside the gates and spend one night, and there was nothing to do but to consent. Our fortifications were battered down; our young men were killed or captive; we were nothing left in the splendid city of Paris but old men and women and children. We had to let them come in, but they could not compel our entertainment. Everywhere shutters were up, and streets empty. Everywhere, also, the national colors were flown upside down, and crepe mingled with them. Over the doors of restaurants and theaters were banners of mourning, and on them inverted shields inscribed: "Closed on account of national bereavement." It was like a dead city. But from behind the shutters of our houses we saw the Prussians come. I was nineteen then. My father and mother were old. I remember standing with my parents to catch a glimpse of the marching columns.

Suddenly, as we watched, a woman leaped from a cellarway almost directly under our window, and stood on the curbstone waving her hands and shouting. Her hair was white; she must have been fifty years old, but she had an air of command.

"*Arrêtez!*" she shrieked at them. "*Meurtriers, poltrons, arrêtez!*" One or two of the soldiers nearest her turned to nudge each other and laugh; but the others marched on, unconscious of her cries. Her hand dropped quickly to her waist and then rose again. I started back in horror. She held a revolver. It spoke three times in quick succession, and three Prussians nearest her dropped bleeding on the pavement. Immediately a dozen men were upon her, reaching for the weapon, and one struck her heavily in the face. There was no need for it; she handed the revolver over quietly.

"Take the gun!" she cried. "It has done its work. You took my man and my two sons. I take three of you. Ha!"—it was a frightful mockery of a laugh. "You can have the gun. Give it to the three on the pavement there. Perhaps it will bring them back."

They hurried her away to the guardhouse. She was mad, they said, and I never saw her after that. Hundreds went mad in those days. It is the thought of them that makes me say, The sorrows which women suffer in the war are too deep for words.

I was eighteen, I remember, when the war was declared. My father was in the wool business, and we lived just outside the city in a pleasant old house with a garden around it.

We did not want a war. But the young men gathered to the colors, and for a few days before the army marched away Paris was as gay as a holiday.

"*A Berlin! A Berlin!*" people shouted, expecting that within a week or two the news would come back that our boys had fought their way through to the very capital of the Prussians, and entered it.

François and I had been engaged three months; we were to be married at Christmas time. He was called to his regiment, the Sixty-second, and for three days or more before the troops marched away he came every evening with news of the mobilizing, until the evening of the last day. That evening there was a note of seriousness that had not been there before. He spoke of rumors that had floated about the camp. The Prussians, it was said, were much stronger than had been supposed. He did not tell me many details; I guessed at them somehow. Some note in his voice, some little added *tendresse* in his manner, something, *je ne sais quoi*, told me. Suddenly I could stand the suspense no longer.

"Suppose," I burst out, "only suppose, François, that you should not come back." He was silent. I glanced up into his eyes, thoroughly frightened.

"François!" I almost shrieked. "Why don't you answer me, François?"

For reply he reached over and took my hand. "I have been thinking, Aimee," he said, "that perhaps—perhaps it would be just as well if we were to be married to-morrow."

I clutched his hand convulsively.

"One can not always be sure what may happen in a war, and—what do you think?" he asked, looking straight down at me.

It was a long time before I answered. In those minutes I seemed to pass from girlhood into womanhood. I swept through at one leap all the experiences that make up our woman's lot. I knew in that instant that whatever came to François, whether in life or pain or death, I must bear my portion of it.

"Let us go to my father and mother," I said simply. We did not need more words: we understood.

"The children are right, dear," said my mother. "We will go with them to-morrow."

François came early in the morning with his mother, and we went all together to the chapel, where arrangements had been made. I tried to fix my attention to the ceremony, but it kept drifting.

"Till death you do part," the priest finished solemnly, and waited for me to speak. I nodded weakly.

The regiment was to leave that afternoon. I walked down and stood on the sidewalk to see them march away. The streets were aflame with the national colors; crowds flocked up and down as though it were a festival.

All along the sidewalk women and bent old men stood weeping, waving wet handkerchiefs or lifting terror-stricken children high up to see their fathers pass. I saw it all as in a haze: my eyes were fixed upon the last company, and there in the front rank, his gun across his shoulder, François came.

Others have written about the siege of Paris who know much more about it than I. At first we did not know there was to be a siege: we could not believe it. The reports that our government issued were gladdening. Our army had met the enemy and conquered it, killing many. Our cavalry had cut off a company of the enemy's troops, and captured many cannon. Our army was marching toward Berlin. These reports came in quick succession. But then came other reports not published, but whispered from mouth to mouth. It was not true that we had conquered. Our army had been driven back. Many were killed, many were wounded, many were captured. And at last came the news that Paris itself was to be besieged.

Even then we could not believe the danger serious. I remember my father coming home with four fine hams and cutting great slices for each of us.

My mother spoke: "Would it not be better to save the ham? There is talk of a siege."

He laughed loudly. "Oh, a siege," he said. "What of it? It cannot last long."

For four months I never saw a piece of bread. A few potatoes we had, but long before the siege was over they had gone. All horses disappeared from the streets. The government took them, and the elephants in the parks. We were issued a card on which was indicated how much horse or elephant meat would be alloted to us every four days.

I walked home alone one afternoon in the dust: two old men, beyond the age of military service, walked in front of me, and as they came opposite our house one stopped and snatching something hastily from the ground, hid it in a bag. "It will mean food to-morrow," he said to his companion. Afterward I discovered what it was that they had snatched up so eagerly. It was our cat.

Next door to us was a woman who had sent two boys to the battle: they were members of the Sixty-second also. She was older than I, as old as my mother, but from the day when the first bad news came to Paris until the siege was raised we were inseparable. We had sent our men to bleed, and our hearts bled with them.

From the very first I used to hear her at night walking up and down her room, walking, walking, walking, walking, with never a pause. Later, when the news grew bad, or, worst of all, when there was no news, I, too, walked.

I will not say that it is harder to wait than to shoot; I do not know. But it seemed to me in those terrible four months that every shell that was fired sent its own agony into my heart. The woman whose sons were gone, and I, followed the same routine. At six o'clock the firing called us. Hastily I would dress and snatch a mouthful of food, and always I found her waiting for me, impatient to be off.

We would run in the direction of the firing, sometimes a mile, sometimes two, and arriving breathless and distraught we would call to the sentries:

"What regiments fight here?"

Then they would tell us: and if, as often happened, the Sixty-second was not engaged, we would hurry across the city to another point where there was the noise of firing. So sometimes all day long we wandered from one far corner of the city to another, and came home at night tired out, but for the moment relieved. The Sixty-second had not fought that day.

Some days there was no fighting, and we sat all day to make bandages, tearing our best linen sheets and tablecloths. We gave them gladly. But generally our days were spent cowering underneath the walls. "The Sixty-second fights here," the sentry would call. And then would come the cruel, slaying wait.

Here is a wounded man brought through the gate! Run quick. "Oh, *s'il vous plait, un moment*, let me see his face!"

"*Ce n'est pas François!*"

"*Ce n'est pas mon fils!*"

"*Grâce à Dieu!*"

There came at last a morning when there was no firing, when the news went around that the war was over. I remember how we wept: and also, by some trick of fancy, I remember the first man who walked through the gates from outside after the siege was raised. He carried a great loaf of white bread. A crowd followed him for blocks laughing and crying out to him, and smacking their lips.

François came back. He looked old. There were dark lines under his eyes; he seemed to stoop a little, as though the weight of the gun had dragged him down. But the same smile was on his face, the same light in his eye. I threw my arms around his neck: it seemed as though my tears would never stop.

"A bloody battle," the newspapers say. "Twenty-five thousand killed and wounded and missing." But no paper tells of twenty-five thousand women who, back home, are killed and wounded, not by bullets but by the news. For twenty-five thousand of them there will be no more sunrise—I think of them all day long and sometimes at night—the thousands of mothers who will struggle heartsick through life with fatherless children, the thousands of sisters left unprotected, and the thousands of wives, some of them young wives, some of them married on the day the troops marched away, as I was.

FROM THE MISSION FIELD.

Releases and Departures.—The following named missionaries have been honorably released from their labors in the British mission, and sailed for home February 12th, 1915, per s.s. *Scandinavian*: Eddis W. Watkins, Aubrey O. Andelin, Orson C. Parker, Andrew Wilson, James C. Lindsay, Gerald Cazier, Benjamin C. Clegg, George F. Macdonald. A company of twenty-six emigrants took passage on the same ship, Elders Eddis W. Watkins, Aubrey O. Andelin and Benjamin C. Clegg being in charge. Elder David I. Stoddard has been honorably released from his labors in the British mission and sailed for home February 13th, 1915, per s.s. *St. Paul.*

CONTENTS:

Baptism 97
Gospel Power 101
Conference Appointments ... 103
Editorials: Study the Scriptures 104
Militarism Glorified 106
What War Means to Women... 108
From the Mission Field 112

EDITED, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HYRUM M. SMITH, 295 EDGE LANE, LIVERPOOL:

FOR SALE IN ALL THE CONFERENCES OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS IN GREAT BRITAIN.